



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/687,699 | 10/12/2000 | Shing Mark Lin | ADAPP171 | 7677 |
| 7590 | 11/13/2003 | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | HUYNH, KIM T | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2189 | |
| DATE MAILED: 11/13/2003 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Advisory Action | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/687,699 | LIN ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Kim T. Huynh | 2189 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. Other: _____

Khanh Dang
Primary Examiner

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration filed on 10/10/03 have been fully considered but does not place application in condition for allowance.
 - a. In response to applicant's argument that McCarty does not discloses an address database that facilitates translation of operating system (OS) independent commands received by a Fibre Channel wrapper module into Fibre Channel commands usable by a Fibre Channel layer module that is in communication with a Fibre Channel controller. As McCarty notes in Figure 2, col.3, line 57-col.4, line 21) McCarty discloses communication path 230 is translating command received from an operating system into operating independent command and the link path 225(FC wrapper module) translating the OS independent command into FC command in FC environment 220 (FC layer module) utilizing address data base changing of FC devices. Therefore it is clear that McCarty does read on the breadth of the claims language, thus properly stated in the rejection of record.
 - b. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Examiner relies

Art Unit: 2189

on McCarty's reference the teaching of translation of the address database between operation system and Fibre channel wrapper module into Fibre Channel layer module for combination. As McCarthy notes at col.4, lines 7-21, it is well established in the art to provide the translation of address database of the multi-device FC communication environment. In that (col.2, lines 1-25), McCarty's purpose is to provide a system for dynamically controlling the configuration of a multi-device FC communication environment, it is clear that McCarty is analogous art and therefore properly combinable for the purpose stated in the rejection of record.

Kim Huynh

Nov. 6, 2003



Khanh Dang
Primary Examiner